

REMARKS

This Office Action has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 14, 2004. Claims 1, 5 to 9, 11, 15 to 19, 23, 24, 27 and 28 are pending in the application, with Claims 2 to 4, 10, 12 to 14, 20 to 22, 25, 26, 29 and 30 having been cancelled. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19, 23 and 24 have been amended, and Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 23 and 24 are in independent form.

A new title has been selected.

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for alleged indefiniteness. Claim 26 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and without conceding the correctness of its rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 to 9, 11, 13 to 19, 23, 24, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Applicant's allegedly Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,113,519 (Johnson); Claims 2 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the AAPA in view of Johnson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,348 (Richard); Claims 10, 20, 25 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Johnson in view of the AAPA; and Claims 21, 22, 26 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Johnson in view of the AAPA and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,907,188 (Suzuki). Claims 2 to 4, 10, 12 to 14, 20 to 22, 25, 26, 29 and 30 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter and without conceding the correctness of their rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the remaining claims are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns accessing an address book within a communication device, in which data of the address book is accessed in response to operations of a local user interface, and data of the address book is also accessed in response to requests from remote devices on a network. A decision is made whether to

permit or deny address book data changing requests for the first and second accesses.

According to one feature of the invention, a first guide display is displayed on the local user interface, wherein the first guide display is operable by a local user to access data of the address book, and wherein address book changes are denied for the second access when the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface.

By virtue of the foregoing, in which a first guide display is displayed on the local user interface, wherein the first guide display is operable by a local user to access data of the address book, and wherein address book changes are denied for a second access when the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface, priority of access to data of the address book is given to a user operating the local user interface.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 as amended is directed to a communication device having an address book storing data of communication destinations. The communication device includes first access means for accessing data of the address book in response to operations of a local user interface, second access means for accessing data of the address book in response to requests from remote devices on a network, and control means for deciding to permit or deny address book data changing requests from the first access means, and from the second access means. In addition, the communication device includes first display control means for displaying a first guide display on the local user interface, wherein the first guide display is operable by a local user to access data of the address book from the first access means, and wherein the control means denies address book changes from the second access means when the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface.

In a similar manner, independent Claims 11 and 23 are respectively directed to a method and a computer program.

Independent Claim 9 as amended is directed to a communication device having an address book storing data of communication destinations. The communication device includes a local operating unit for accessing data of the address book for a local user

via a local user interface, a remote operating unit for accessing data of the address book for remote users on a network, and a control unit for deciding to permit or deny address book data changing requests from the local operating unit, and from the remote operating unit. In addition, the communication device includes a first display control unit for displaying a first guide display on the local user interface, wherein the first guide display is operable by a user to access data of the address book from the local operating unit, and wherein the control unit denies address book changes from the remote operating unit when the first guide is displayed on the local user interface.

In a similar manner, independent Claims 19 and 24 as amended are respectively directed to a method and a computer program.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention of the subject application. In particular, the AAPA, and the Johnson, Richard and Suzuki patents, are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of displaying a first guide display on the local user interface, wherein the first guide display is operable by a local user to access data of the address book, and wherein address book changes are denied for a second access when the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface.

As understood by Applicants, Johnson discloses a protocol which allows processes in a distributed environment to access a file either through system calls, e.g. read and write, or through a mechanism that maps the file to their own address space such that the attributes of the files are efficiently and accurately distributed to all of the interested processes. In managing a file size attribute, clients that perform read or write system calls obtain permission to do so from the server of the file by requesting one of the file's read tokens or the file's write token. Changes in the file size due to write system calls can be reflected by updating the size kept at the write token. See Johnson, column 6, lines 11 to 25.

Although Johnson describes the prevention of write system calls, it is not seen to teach that write system calls are denied when a first guide display is displayed on a local user interface. Rather, clients in Johnson seeking to write to a file must do so by requesting the file's write token. Since only one client can have the write token at a time, other clients are precluded from changing the file while the write token is in use. Thus, Johnson denies changes based on a write token. This is different than the present invention, in which changing the data of the address book is denied for the second access when the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface. It is the display of the first guide display in the present invention, rather than the possession of a write token as described in Johnson, that denies changing data of the address book by the second access. Accordingly, Johnson is not seen to disclose or suggest that a first guide display is displayed on the local user interface, wherein the first guide display is operable by a local user to access data of the address book, and wherein address book changes are denied for a second access when the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface. In addition, Johnson is not seen to teach the attendant benefits that such prevention of changing the data provides, including improved access to data of the address book by a user operating the local user interface.

In addition, the AAPA, and the Richard and Suzuki patents have been reviewed and are not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Johnson.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 23 and 24 as amended are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 88239v1